

REMARKS

The last Office Action of August 2, 2000 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 and 18-21 are pending in the application. Claims 13-17 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claim 10 and 12 have been cancelled.

It is noted that claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to two different statutory classes of invention. Claim 10 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11 and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 3,532,141 (hereinafter "Larsson").

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,108,134 (hereinafter "Irwin").

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 2,225,208 (hereinafter "Crickmer").

REJECTION OF CLAIM 10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Applicant has canceled claim 10, thereby obviating the rejection thereof under 35 U.S.C. §101 and 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §101 and §112 second paragraph is thus respectfully requested.

**REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-4, 6-9 and 18-21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102 AS
BEING ANTICIPATED BY LARSSON**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-9 and 18-21 as being anticipated by the Larsson reference. Applicant has amended claim 1 to set forth more clearly what applicant considers to be his invention. As amended, claim 1 is believed to now patentably distinguish over the cited prior art.

Larsson discloses a joint of a sleeve and a tube but Larsson does not disclose the features as recited in claim 1. Specifically, Larsson differs from the claimed invention in that Larsson does not disclose the anchoring groove for seating the O-ring facing towards the inner space of the sleeve and which is a feature of the claimed joint. Larsson does not disclose a separate compartment for seating the O-ring. The critical aspect of the O-ring in a separate compartment is that the seat of the ring is fixed. As the complementary rib of the press tool impinges upon the sleeve the o-ring is in fixed position and cannot be displaced by the operation of the press tool. If the O-ring is not seated in a separate compartment, the pressing operation has the force to dislocate the O-ring during the pressing operation, thereby causing shifting the O-ring.

Furthermore, Larsson does not disclose the holding element with a component for penetration of the pipe in the manner as claimed. As seen in

Fig. 4, the element 12 as it extends penetrates the metal tube upon forming the juncture of the sleeve with the metal tube. This component of the holding element comprises a plurality of arcuate cutting projections alternatively a cutting edge for positively engaging the sleeve with the metal pipe.

In view of the foregoing discussion, it is believed that claim 1 as amended patentably distinguishes over the prior art. Since claims 2-4, 6-9, 11 and 18-21 are either directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, they contain all the features of claim 1 and are also patentably distinguished over the prior art.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4, 6-9 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is thus respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103 AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER LARSSON IN VIEW OF IRWIN

It is believed that claim 5, as now on file is clearly distinguishable over Larsson in view of Irwin for reasons, which will be set forth hereinafter.

The Examiner has cited Larsson as disclosing applicant's joint with the exception of the conical receiving groove and the holding element having the matching shape. The examiner has then cited Irwin for combining with the teaching of Larsson in order to arrive at the joint applicant claims.

Applicant submits that the Irwin reference shows a pipe connector structure such as an "olive" in which the pipes are inserted and which are then crimped around the portion of each mated spigot. This is in contrast to the

claimed joint wherein the holding element has a material penetrating component that positively engages in the material structure of the end portion of the pipe. The Examiner has not explained how the teaching in Irwin would be applied to Larsson except to mention that the holding area could engage the inserted pipe. There is no clarity on this neither from the language nor the drawings of the Irwin reference. In any case Irwin does not disclose the projections or a cutting edge for pipe engagement.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103 and allowance thereof are thus respectfully requested.

CITED REFERENCES

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the newly submitted claims. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that when the Examiner reconsiders the claims in the light of the above comments, he will agree that the invention is in no way properly met or anticipated or even suggested by any of the references however they are considered.

None of the references discloses a configuration of joint connection with a separate groove for an O-ring, nor a holding element with the projections as claimed for penetration of a pipe.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.


Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-0502.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Henry M. Feiereisen
Agent For Applicant
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: January 2, 2001
350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3220
New York, N.Y. 10118
(212)244-5500
HMF/UBD:be